UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,288	04/07/2000	Stephane Ayala	1032326-000057	1602
	7590 12/08/201 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	TRINH, MINH N		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3729	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/08/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com offserv@bipc.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/545,288	AYALA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Minh Trinh	3729			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Oc</u>	ctoher 2010				
,	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٥/١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	ciocoa in accordance with the practice andor E	x parte gaayle, 1000 C.D. 11, 10	.0.0.210.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	·					
Applicati	on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b)□ objected to by the E	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	9 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Art Unit: 3729

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment to the claim languages filed on 10/7/10 has been fully considered and made of record.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 47-50 and 54-55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 7,663,564 to Ayala et al , hereinafter '564. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully claimed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

The '564 claim a method for producing support sheet as represented in details in claims 1-2 and 47-50 as well as 54-55 (compare to claims 8-10 of the '564).

Art Unit: 3729

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 47-50 and 52- 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidalgo (5,598,032) in view of Graumet et al (5640306). This rejection is set forth in prior Action, paragraph 4.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (see above).

Further, applicants contends that regarding to amended Claims 47, 54 and 55 each recite that "a conductive segment crosses over at least one turn of the at least two turns while being electrically insulated from the at least one turn of the at least two turns" (see Remarks, page 12 about paragraphs 3-5). This has been fully noted and not found to be persuasive because the above feature is taught by the secondary reference to Graumet et al (Applicants refer to Fig. 4 for the teaching of a conductive element 10 is substantially crosses over element 11 (where 11 as broadly as readable as the claimed at least one turn of the at least two turns). For the above reason it is reasonable to use a conductive element 10 as taught by Graumet et al onto the invention of Fidalgo in order to obtain the smart card assembly having the above structure associated therefrom.(see col.1, and col. 2, lines 48-50 for the motivation for the combination).

Art Unit: 3729

6. Applicant's arguments do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

7. Claims 1-2, 4, 13-24 and 45-46 are allowed.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3729

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mt

12/2/10

/Minh Trinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729